

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Illinois

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Illinois. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Illinois, 2793 of a possible 3515 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .795, for a rating of 79.5%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality/resolution, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below: Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q10, “Overall, was 2005 NAIP acquisition and deliver in your County/State timely enough to be useful in support of your programs?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.951612903	Mean	4.183333333	Mean	4.180327869	Mean	4.338709677	Mean	3.843137255
Standard Error	0.151543128	Standard Error	0.120008631	Standard Error	0.105861536	Standard Error	0.11713021	Standard Error	0.123264578
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	5	Median	4
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	4
Standard Deviation	1.193251782	Standard Deviation	0.92958286	Standard Deviation	0.82680503	Standard Deviation	0.922284199	Standard Deviation	0.880285159
Sample Variance	1.423849815	Sample Variance	0.864124294	Sample Variance	0.683606557	Sample Variance	0.850608144	Sample Variance	0.774901961
Kurtosis	-0.085066387	Kurtosis	3.561130927	Kurtosis	-0.163649242	Kurtosis	0.577331481	Kurtosis	0.790959696
Skewness	-0.921119266	Skewness	-1.689690285	Skewness	-0.717878437	Skewness	-1.255279652	Skewness	-0.597211891
Range	4	Range	4	Range	3	Range	3	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	245	Sum	251	Sum	255	Sum	269	Sum	196
Count	62	Count	60	Count	61	Count	62	Count	51
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	4.155172414	Mean	3.829268293	Mean	3.982142857	Mean	7.80952381	Mean	7.396825397
Standard Error	0.117448484	Standard Error	0.151828044	Standard Error	0.12610826	Standard Error	0.210887893	Standard Error	0.281299452
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	5	Mode	3	Mode	4	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	0.894461009	Standard Deviation	0.972173828	Standard Deviation	0.943707802	Standard Deviation	1.673870759	Standard Deviation	2.232745182
Sample Variance	0.800060496	Sample Variance	0.945121951	Sample Variance	0.890584416	Sample Variance	2.801843318	Sample Variance	4.98515105
Kurtosis	-0.742152898	Kurtosis	-1.136673859	Kurtosis	0.471187119	Kurtosis	1.074111076	Kurtosis	-0.159069329
Skewness	-0.620707311	Skewness	-0.155390932	Skewness	-0.771204767	Skewness	-0.668808845	Skewness	-0.662820349
Range	3	Range	3	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	241	Sum	157	Sum	223	Sum	492	Sum	466
Count	58	Count	41	Count	56	Count	63	Count	63

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

